DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 094 IR 007 844

AUTHOR Korzenny, Felipe; And Others
TITLE Styles of Parental Disciplinary Practices As a Mediator of Children's Learning from Antisocial Television Portrayals.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 25p.; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Aggression; *Anti Social Behavior; Bibliographies; Commercial Television; *Discipline; Mass Media; *Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Responsibility; *Television Research; Television Surveys

ABSTRACT

This study examines the effect of parental socialization forces on children's learning of antisocial behavior from television portrayals. The intervening variables are the patterns of parental disciplinary practices and general interaction with their children in their everyday life. Two types of parental styles were identified: induction, characterized by a loving attitude, based on reason, explanation, and pointing out the consequences of the child's actions on others, and sensitizing parental behaviors, those that focus on external consequences of social behaviors without providing the child with a cognitive frame of reference for internalizing moral guidelines. Three types of antisocial behaviors are studied: physical and verbal aggression and deceit. The relationship between watching these types of behavior on television and the child's own antisocial predispositions were studied for different combinations of parental styles. The results indicate that children of those parents who are highly inductive and who only occasionally resort to sensitizing techniques are the least affected by physical and verbal aggression on television. In the case of physical aggression, children whose parents are mostly sensitizing and seldom utilize inductive techniques tend to be the most affected. Although the differences among correlation coefficients were not statistically significant, the trends encountered rendered encouraging support to the theoretical expectations. Data tables and a list of references are attached. (Author/RAO)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178094

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STYLES OF PARENTAL DISCIPLINARY PRACTICES AS A MEDIATOR OF CHILDREN'S LEARNING FROM ANTISOCIAL TELEVISION PORTRAYALS

by

Felipe Korzenny
Bradley S. Greenberg
Charles K. Atkin

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Scott B. Bramson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR007944

ABSTRACT

This study attempts to specify some of the conditions under which children's modeling of antisocial TV portrayals are minimized and maximized. The intervening variables are the patterns of parental disciplinary practices and general interaction with their children in their everyday life. It is argued that enduring parental modes should mediate the degree to which children acquire and express antisocial predispositions modeled after TV offerings.

Two main types of parental styles were identified in the literature dealing with parental practices that influence children's moral development: induction and sensitization. Inductive parental behaviors are love-oriented, based on reasoning, explanation, and pointing out the consequences of the child's behaviors on others. Sensitizing parental behaviors are those that focus on external consequences of social behaviors without providing the child with a cognitive frame of reference for internalizing moral guidelines.

Three types of antisocial behaviors are studied: physical and verbal aggression and deceit. The relationship between watching these types of behavior on television and the child's own antisocial predispositions were studied for different combinations of parental styles. The results indicate that children of those parents who are highly inductive and who only occasionally resort to sensitizing techniques are the least affected by physical and verbal aggression on television. In the case of physical aggression, children whose parents are mostly sensitizing and seldom utilize inductive techniques tend to be the most affected. Although the differences among correlation coefficients were not statistically significant, the trends encountered rendered encouraging support to the theoretical expectations.

STYLES OF PARENTAL DISCIPLINARY PRACTICES AS A MEDIATOR OF CHILDREN'S LEARNING FROM ANTISOCIAL TELEVISION PORTRAYALS

The present investigation examines the effect of parental socialization forces on children's learning of antisocial entertainment TV portrayals. Prior studies have looked at the effect of parental control of their children's television exposure and interpretation of television content. Very little research has assessed generalized patterns of socialization as mediating forces in what children learn and perform from what they watch on the TV screen.

In this section past research dealing with parental mediation of children's learning from television will be briefly reviewed. Then, a core theoretical perspective dealing with parental modes of discipline and interaction will be presented and implications of these parental modes for children's learning from television antisocial portrayals will be derived.

Parental control over TV viewing is not very pervasive in general, and it is mainly directed towards bedtime, sexual television content and towards stopping exposure to undesirable shows once they have started (Hanneman et al., 1975; Atkin, 1972; and Barcus, 1969).

TV content interpretation by parents or others can be a powerful tool in promoting learning of desirable behaviors or of cautions regarding antisocial TV presentations. Interpretation has been found to promote learning (Chu and Schramm, 1967; Ball and Bogatz, 1972; Atkin and Gantz, 1974; McLeod, Atkin and Chaffee, 1972; Tolley, 1973; Hicks, 1968; Feschbach, 1972; Walling, 1976). In general, it seems that those parents who take the time and exert the effort to explain television content, and teach critical discrimination of television may effectively innoculate them against possible negative influences (Leifer et al, 1974).

Given the pervasiveness of the TV medium, parents seem to have trouble specifying rules for TV watching. Children may need other types of protection from the medium, preferably those controls that are internalized in the course of their socialization.

The impact of family interaction styles on children's acquisition and performance of antisocial TV behaviors has not been clearly established but the evidence is suggestive, for example, Atkin (1972) reported that:

> The relationship between violence viewing and aggressive behavior in homes where the parent tried to teach the child not to act aggressively was compared to homes where a more laissez-faire attitude was implemented. The relationship between violence viewing and aggressive behavior was much stronger in the half of the . . . samples where no emphasis was placed on nonviolent behavior--while only a slight positive relationship was found where the parents did emphasize non-violence (p.2).

Relevant to the role of parental mediatory capacity on the relationship between TV exposure and the child's willingness to perform antisocial behaviors, numerous studies have shown that there is a relationship between parental disciplinary practices and the internalized control of their children's social behavior (Allinshmith, 1960; Aronfreed, 1961; Bandura and Walters, 1959; Burton, Maccoby and Allinsmith, 1961; Hoffman and Saltzstein, 1967; and Sears, et al., 1957).

Aronfreed (1961) found that there was a clear tendency for love-oriented mothers to have children who focus their attention on internal aspects of the wrongdoing, while power assertive, or externally-oriented mothers were more likely to have children focus their attention on the external aspects of transgressions.

Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) found that parental power assertion techniques were consistently associated with weak moral internalization in the children.

Two main global categories of disciplinary interactions among parents and their children have been identified by Aronfreed (1969, 1976) and Hoffman (1970, 1975). One of these disciplinary types is called induction, and the other sensitization.

> Induction types of discipline have in common . . . that they tend to make the child's control of its behavior independent of external contingencies. In contrast, disciplinary habits of direct physical and verbal attack may be characterized as sensitization because they tend merely to sensitize the child to the anticipation of punishment (Aronfreed, 1969, pp. 309-310).

In general, induction techniques include the use of reasoning and explanation, e.g., to point out the requirements of a situation, or the consequences of the behavior for the child or others. Also, appeals to the child's pride and achievement are considered to be inductive techniques.

Sensitization, sometimes called power assertion, "includes physical punishment, deprivation of material objects or privileges, the direct applications of force, or the threat of any of these" (Hoffman, 1970, p. 285). Although less documented in the literature, the use of external rewards is also expected to belong to the class of parental practices that have been labeled sensitizing techniques. External rewards "reduce intrinsic motivation by creating the impression that one's behavior is externally prompted and by weakening feelings of competence and self-determination" (Bandura, 1977, p. 107).

The main difference between these two modes of parental discipline is that induction is communication oriented and sensitization is based on the

exercise of actual and implied power. Induction can be said to provide the cognitive structure with which the child will be able to categorize his social experiences: "Cognitive structure facilitates internalized suppression by serving as an intrinsic mediator of anxiety which can intercede before the commission of a punished act" (Aronfreed, 1969, p. 276).

Sensitization, by requiring continuous surveillance, and by being limited to the disciplinary event, reduces the length of time during which the child experiences anxiety for transgressions.

According to Hoffman (1970), dissonance theory would also account for the effectiveness of induction in forming an independent moral orientation. Induction techniques exert little external power over the child and if she/he refrains from a negative behavior, she/he will be more likely to reduce dissonance by thinking that she/he refrained voluntarily. However, sensitizing techniques are too obvious and the child may just think that she/he refrained due to external demands. Furthermore, because inductive techniques point out the consequences of the child's behavior for others, they may develop the child's capacity for empathy. So if transgression occurs, the child who learned by induction strategies will be more likely to experience emotional discomfort or guilt.

Actually, inductive techniques may be more severe than sensitizing techniques, due to their property of conservation of anxiety, e.g., guilt feelings may be more long lasting than the physical pain derived from a spanking.

Induction and sensitization are not mutually exclusive. The parent may balance both techniques in a variety of ways. The ideal combination should be a minimal amount of sensitization and some larger proportion of inductive parental acts (Hoffman and Saltzstein, 1967). "Apparently, a spoonful of medicine helps the reasoning go down" (Lickona, 1976, p. 25).

An affective and love-oriented family seems to be a prerequisite for inductive techniques to be effective (Hoffman, 1970, p.286). Sears et al, (1957) in their extensive study of children's acquisition of social behaviors, found that accepting mothers who love their children and use inductive more than sensitizing techniques produce children with more moral internalization than other mothers. In general, a fairly constant positive correlation has been found between nurturance of parents and internalization (Aronfreed, 1969, p. 305).

Love withdrawal in the form of ignoring, refusing to speak, explicitly stating dislike, and isolating the child, are considered as inductive techniques by Aronfreed (1968, p. 314). However, this has not been found to be as consistently related to the internalization of morality as the other inductive techniques detailed above (Saltzstein, 1976, p. 254; Hoffman, 1975, p. 233). The reasons cited for this lack of consistent relationship is that other-oriented induction capitalizes on the child's capacity for empathy, while love withdrawal only emphasizes egoistic concerns, more in accord with sensitizing child rearing practices.

To summarize, one can say that a love-oriented family will tend to have children who are less dependent upon external stimulation for proper behavior to take place. A love oriented family is that in which parents use power assertion (sensitization) only when absolutely necessary, but tend to guide their children's social behavior on the basis of considering the consequences of the child's behavior for others, and use reasoning and explanation as the mode of problem resolution. Loss of love as a disciplinary measure is not necessarily effective in promoting moral internalization.

It is illuminating to call attention to a parallel that Saltzstein (1976) has drawn between the set of techniques described above and Kelman's types of

attitude change in response to social influence: "Power assertion goes with compliance; love withdrawal and sometimes parent-oreinted, and even peer-oriented, induction with identification; and the reasoning component of induction with internalization (pp. 261-262).

A child who has internalized moral standards can be expected to be in a better position to reject portrayals of negative behaviors offered on the television screen. The core of the matter resides in the differentiation between "good" and"evil" based on internal conviction and not on external considerations. A child who does not have an internal pilot for social behavior will model those negative portrayals which he/she has witnessed when the likelihood of discovery and external punishment is minimal. A strong moral conscience can be thought of as a servant who follows the child everywhere and prevents him/her from undesirable behavior. This servant is inside the child and its punishments and rewards may be more powerful than all the spankings or prizes of a parent. Children may learn, from many televised instances, that by resorting to force they can obtain certain satisfactions. However, only those with internalized moral values will say "no, it's wrong." Some also will say "no," but because "I may be punished."

The combination of a high regime of inductive guidelines and scarce sensitizing parental practices should be the optimum mix to permit the child to evaluate the social situations. When parents generally resort to sensitizing techniques and less often to inductive methods, their children should be more willing to perform the antisocial behaviors they witness on television, due to their low level of moral internalization.

Given the two dimensions of parental disciplinary practices, induction and sensitization, one would expect that the relationship between antisocial TV exposure and antisocial behavioral predispositions should be lowest for those children whose parents are mostly inductive.

The relationship between antisocial TV exposure and antisocial behavioral predispositions should be highest for those children whose parents are mostly sensitizing.

Those individual children who fall in between the extremes of parental sensitization and induction should exhibit an intermediate correlation between their exposure to antisocial television portrayals and their antisocial behavioral predispositions.

METHODS

Mothers and their children who were part of a panel sample contacted in 1976 and 1977 provided the data base for this study. A total of 300 mother-child pairs were studied in the first wave, and 227 were successfully recontacted in the follow-up survey. Mothers were interviewed at home by trained interviewers, and the children were administered questionnaires in their school classrooms.

The data were collected in two comparable cities of the United States, Haslett, Michigan (N=130) and Verona, Wisconsin (N=97), from working class and middle class respondents. The children were from the fourth-fifth (N=74), sixth-seventh (N=81), and eighth-ninth (N=72), grades.

The average interviewing time for the mothers was approximately 45 minutes. The children took about one hour in the average to complete their questionnaires.

The measures used to tap the internal and external orientations of the parents were based on the instrument utilized by Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967). Parental reactions towards the child's behavior were obtained in response to hypothetical situations.

In order to tap the two parental orientations, two sets of items were constructed. Each mother was presented with eight situations, four positive and four negative, as follows:

Positive situations

Suppose (NAME OF CHILD) does something really nice for you to show that (HE/SHE) loves you. What would you do?

Suppose (NAME OF CHILD) helps a friend in the neighborhood with some hard work, and you hear about it. What would you do?

Suppose (NAME OF CHILD) does something really nice for someone in your family. What would you do?

Suppose (NAME OF CHILD) apologizes and tells you (HE/SHE) is really sorry for something bad (HE/SHE) did to you. What would you do?

Negative situations

Suppose (NAME OF CHILD) hits a kid in the neighborhood after an argument, and you find out. What would you do?

Suppose you asked (NAME OF CHILD) to do something for you, and (HE/SHE) doesn't do it. What would you do?

Suppose (NAME OF CHILD) lied to you and you find out. What would you do?

Suppose (NAME OF CHILD) gets mad and yells at you. What would you do?

If the father was living at home, all questions were adapted to read "you and your husband" so as to apply to both parents. The response items are displayed in Table 1; catagories and scoring are "yes" (2), "maybe" (1), and "no" (0) across each of eight situations.

Table 1 shows that the means for the response items belonging to the positive situations are generally higher than for the negative ones, the internal items have higher means than the external ones.

The items were submitted to a principal factor analysis routine with varimax rotation, limiting the extraction of factors to the two hypothesized induction and sensitization dimensions. Table 2 contains the results of this analysis. The indexes were ordered according to their position in the inductive or in the sensitizing orientation. As can be seen, the two expected dimensions appeared, with a loading of .35 considered the cut-off point. Factor 1 underlies the inductive orientation, and factor 2 comprises the sensitizing orientation of parental practices.

In the factor-analytic solution, the inductive dimension accounted for 28% of the total variance, and the sensitizing orientation accounted for 12%.

To represent the inductive and sensitizing orientations for parental practices, two overall indexes were created by summating those indexes that loaded together in each factor. The "don't talk" index that did not clearly load in the sensitizing dimension was excluded.

The mean level for the sensitizing orientation index is 68.6 with a range of 0-80; the internal consistency alpha coefficient is .85. The mean for the inductive index is much lower, 18.3, but the potential range is only 0-56. The coefficient alpha is .72. The standard deviation is proportionately higher for the inductive (10.2) than the sensitizing (11.8) index. The correlation between the two indices is +.36, indicating that parents who are more inductively oriented also tend to be more concerned with sensitizing considerations.

In order to tap the children's proclivity to utilize antisocial modes of conflict resolution, the mothers were asked to report the likelihood that the child may respond antisocially across varied social situations. This method has been utilized in the research concerning children's modeling of TV antisocial behaviors, especially physical aggression (e.g. Leifer and Roberts, 1972).

The mothers were presented with social situations and response items such as these:

> What if someone cut in front of (HIM/HER) in a long line. What would (HE/SHE) do? . . .
>
> Would (HE/SHE) push them out . . . yes, maybe, or no?
>
> Would (HE/SHE) yell at them . . . yes, maybe, or no?
>
> Would (HE/SHE) tell them politely to leave?

Suppose (HIS/HER) friends are all going to the movies, but you order (HIM/HER) to stay home and finis' (HIS/HER) homework for school.

Would (HE/SHE) argue with you?

Would (HE/SHE) finish (HIS/HER) homework like you tell (HIM/HER)?

Would (HE/SHE) lie and say (HE/SHE) already finished it?

There were a total of five situations and 14 response items measured, with each scored 0, 1, and 2. Items were summed into physical aggression (range from 0-4), verbal aggression (range from 0-6), and deceit (0-6).

In order to assess exposure to TV antisocial behaviors, the children were asked to rate a list of 29 shows as to whether they watched each of the shows "every week," "most weeks," "some weeks," or "never."

The evening and Saturday morning shows were selected on the bases of relatively high viewership, and behaviors characteristically portrayed in those shows. The selection of high viewership levels of each show and the variability of portrayal of antisocial behaviors in each show was carried out according to the results of a recent viewership and content analysis set of studies (Greenberg, Atkin, Edison and Korzenny, 1977).

The viewership rating of each show was weighted by the frequency of occurrence of the three types of antisocial behaviors presented in each show. The exposure indices were created for physical aggression (range 352-1502, mean 848), verbal aggression (range 534-1857, mean 1020), and deceit (range 126-518, mean 288).

RESULTS

The results of this study will be presented according to the areas of social behavior investigated, e.g., physical and verbal aggression, and deceit. The analytical tool utilized was contingent correlation analysis.

The internal and external dimensions of parental orientations were divided at the median in order to obtain the following four cells, each of which contains a correlation coefficient.

SENSITIZING ORIENTATION		INDUCTIVE ORIENTATION: LOW	INDUCTIVE ORIENTATION: HIGH
	LOW	r1	r2 (lowest)
	HIGH	r3 (highest)	r4

The correlation coefficient in each of the cells is computed between exposure to one of the four types of antisocial behaviors on television, and the corresponding type of antisocial disposition in the child. The largest correlation is predicted for cell 3, followed by cell 4, cell 1, and cell 2.

Z tests for difference between independent correlations were used in order to assess the statistical significance of the differences between pairs of correlations (Bruning and Kintz, 1968, pp. 191-192).

Physical Aggression

First of all, the overall correlation between the child's exposure to TV physical aggression and the mother's report of the child's physically aggressive predispositions was $r=.31$ ($p \leq .001$). This correlation indicates that there is a moderate degree of relationship between wathcing TV

physical aggression and the child's predispositions, and it is consistent with past research.

Table 3 presents the contingent correlations obtained at different intersections of the inductive and sensitizing parental orientations. The results in this table seem to corroborate the original expectations. The correlation in the low sensitizing, high inductive cell is lower than the overall correlation and the one at the high sensitizing, low inductive cell. Also, the correlations at the high-high and low-low cells are in between the other two correlations. However, the differences do not achieve statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level.

Verbal Aggression

The overall correlation between the child's self-report of exposure to TV verbal aggression and the mother's report of the child's verbally aggressive predispositions was $r=.23$ ($p \leq .001$.)

Table 3 presents the correlations at different intersections of the inductive and sensitizing dimensions for parents. The patterns of correlations is close to the expectations, although the correlations at the high-high or low-low intersections don't fall between the high inductive-low sensitizing and the high sensitizing-low inductive coefficients. As expected, the lowest correlation in the table is that at the high inductive-low sensitizing cell. All comparisons among the correlation coefficients are nonsignificant, except for the comparison between the overall coefficient and the one located at the high inductive-low sensitizing cell, which is in the predicted direction ($p < .05$).

Deceit

The overall correlation between the child's self-report of exposure to deceit on television and the child's favorable predispositions towards

deceit, as reported by the mother, was r=.28 ($p \leq .001$.)

Table 3 presents the correlations obtained between exposure to TV deceit and the child's favorable predispositions towards this type of behavior at different intersections of the inductive and sensitizing orientations of the parents.

The low inductive-high sensitizing cell shows the lowest correlation in the table, the exact opposite direction to the hypothesized relationships. None of the comparisons are statistically significant.

To summarize, it can be said that in general, the patterns of correlations confirm the expectations. Averaging the three sets of correlations in each cell, the high induction-low sensitization correlation of +.10 is substantially lower than the other three cells which range from +.24 to +.30. However, when inferential statistical tests were used, no significant differences among the correlation coefficients appeared.

DISCUSSION

This research attempted to specify some of the conditions under which children's modeling of antisocial TV portrayals are minimized and maximized. The conditions studied were the patterns of parental discipline and interaction with their children in their everyday life and not only with reference to TV watching situations or specific content issues.

It was argued that enduring parental modes of discipline and interaction should mediate the degree to which children acquire and express antisocial predispositions modeled after TV offerings.

Two main types of parental styles were identified in the literature dealing with children's moral development, induction and sensitization. Inductive parental behaviors are love oriented, based on reasoning, explanation, and on pointing out the consequences of the child's behavior on others. Sensitizing parental behaviors are those that point out to the external consequences of social behaviors without providing the child with a cognitive frame of reference for internalizing moral guidelines.

Three types of antisocial behaviors were studied: physical and verbal aggression and deceit. The relationships between watching these types of antisocial behavior and the child's own antisocial predispositions were studied for different combinations of styles.

The results indicated that those parents who are mostly inductive and who only occasionally resort to sensitizing techniques are the ones whose children seem to be the lease affected by antisocial television content in the specific areas of physical and verbal aggression. It was also found that those parents who are mostly sensitizing and who seldom utilize inductive techniques are the ones whose children tend to be highly affected by physically and verbally aggressive television portrayals. The evidence in the case of deceit was not supportive, however.

Although the differences among correlation coefficients were not statistically significant, the trends encountered rendered support to the expectations theoretically derived in this paper.

The main implication of this study is that parental socialization styles do seem to have an effect on what children obtain from TV entertainment programming. Policy makers should take notice of these findings since in the ongoing controversy regarding the social role of television, not only broadcasters need to be made aware of the effect of their programs, but parents should be alerted to the potential effect of their disciplinary

practices on what their children accept from television. Also, and perhaps most important, this research highlights the importance of studying media impact in the social context where social behavior occurs. The specification of conditions under which TV modeling takes place is of urgent importance so that remedial action takes place where it's needed, e.g., at home.

The lack of clear results in the cases of deceit may be due to several factors. Deceit, in the form of lying or cheating, may not be the type of behavior that inductive parents censor to any large extent. It may be that an occasional lie is not considered to be the opportunity for a discussion session between parents and children.

This study should be replicated with larger samples and refined instruments in order to more conclusively derive inferences for larger populations and a wider range of behaviors. At this point the best conclusion is a conservative one: a trend was found which seems promising.

Future research in this area should also investigate the potential of parental styles of discipline and interaction with their children on the children's acquisition of prosocial dispositions from the TV medium. It is plausible to think that highly inductive parents may facilitate their children's modeling of positive behaviors such as altruism. Sensitizing parents may inhibit the acquisition of socially desirable behaviors due to their orientation towards external aspects of social behavior.

It would also be worth investigating the degree to which parental styles influence voluntary exposure to television entertainment programming in general, and the selectivity of such exposure in particular. It may be the case that inductive parents have a greater influence in their children's taste regarding TV content. Inductively raised children may dislike portrayals that they feel are inappropriate or immoral. Also,

inductively trained children may be the ones to prefer a larger mix of leisure activities than an exclusive diet of television.

Television's impact is not the only one that can be mediated by different parental styles. Other media effects should be investigated in the light of parental socialization practices.

Future research may do well to include other socialization agents besides parents. Siblings, peers, teachers, and other significant sources of influence should be studied simultaneously. The social environment in which the child develops needs to be considered when media impact is to be specified for better understanding and more effective policy decisions.

Table 1. Means for Each Index of Parental Response to Social Situations

Negative Situations	$\bar{X}$
INDUCTION	
1. Say you are disappointed in (HIM/HER)	6.8
2. Explain why (HE/SHE) shouldn't behave that way	7.5
3. Say (HIS/HER) behavior makes you feel bad	6.7
4. Tell (HIM/HER) another way to solve (HIS/HER) problem	7.1
SENSITIZATION	
5. Don't talk to (HIM/HER) for a while	0.3
6. Yell at (HIM/HER)	3.4
7. Hit, spank or shake (HIM/HER)	1.2
8. Keep (HIM/HER) from watching TV	2.4
9. Don't let (HIM/HER) go out for a while	4.3
Positive Situations	
INDUCTION	
10. Say you are proud of (HIM/HER)	7.4
11. Tell (HIM/HER) to feel good about what (HE/SHE) did	6.6
12. Kiss or hug or pat (HIM/HER) on the back	6.1
13. Explain why it was a good thing to do	6.5
14. Say that you appreciate the good things (SHE/HE) does	7.6
15. Tell (HIM/HER) reasons why (HE/SHE) should keep doing these things	6.3
SENSITIZATION	
16. Let (HIM/HER) do something (HE/SHE) wanted to do very badly	3.4
17. Let (HIM/HER) watch extra TV	1.7
18. Give (HIM/HER) something special	2.1

Table 2. Principal Factor Matrix With Varimax Rotation, Ordered According to Hypothesized Indexes Loadings, for Parental Practices.

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2
Inductive Orientation		
Say you are disappointed in (HIM/HER)	.44	.26
Explain why (HE/SHE) shouldn't behave that way	.67	.07
Say (HIS/HER) behavior makes you feel bad	.44	.27
Tell (HIM/HER) another way to solve (HIS/HER) problem	.72	-.01
Say you are proud of (HIM/HER)	.52	.09
Tell (HIM/HER) to feel good about what (HE/SHE) did	.64	.09
Kiss or hug or pat (HIM/HER) on the back	.36	.14
Explain why it was a good thing to do	.79	.07
Say that you appreciate the good things (HE/SHE) does	.52	.11
Tell (HIM/HER) reasons why (HE/SHE) should keep doing these things	.80	.14
Sensitizing Orientation		
Don't talk to (HIM/HER) for a while	.04	.17
Yell at (HIM/HER)	-.09	.35
Hit, spank, or shake (HIM/HER)	-.00	.36
Keep (HIM/HER) from watching TV	.22	.54
Don't let (HIM/HER) go out for a while	.19	.39
Let (HIM/HER) do something (HE/SHE) wanted to do very badly	.23	.67
Let (HIM/HER) watch extra TV	.11	.64
Give (HIM/HER) something special	.19	.54

Table 3. Contingent Correlations Between Exposure and Anti-social Behavior For Four Combinations of Inductive and Sensitizing Orientations[1]

Sensitizing Orientation	Inductive Orientation: Low	Inductive Orientation: High
Low	Phys. Agg. r = +.27* Verb. Agg. r = +.26* Deceit r = +.38** N = 57	Phys. Agg. r = +.19 Verb. Agg. r = -.09 Deceit r = +.20 N = 45
High	Phys. Agg. r = +.44** Verb. Agg. r = +.15 Deceit r = +.12 N = 37	Phys. Agg. r = +.23* Verb. Agg. r = +.26* Deceit r = +.28* N = 57

Correlation coefficients are computed between corresponding indices of exposure and behavioral dispositions for each type of anti-social behavior.

** $P \leq .01$
* $P \leq .05$

[1] When the two dimensions are divided at the median

REFERENCES

Allinsmith, W. (1960), The Learning of Moral Standards. In D. R. Miller and G. E. Swanson, editors, Inner Conflict and Defense. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Aronfreed, J. (1961), The Nature, Variety, and Social Patterning of Moral Responses to Transgression. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 63, No. 2, pp. 223-240.

Aronfreed, J. (1968), Aversive Control of Socialization. In William J. Arnold, editor, Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press.

Aronfreed, J. (1968b), Conduct and Conscience: The Socialization of Internalized Control Over Behavior. New York: Academic Press.

Aronfreed, J. (1969), The Concept of Internalization. In D. A. Goslin, editor, Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Aronfreed, J. (1976), Moral Development from the Standpoint of a General Psychological Theory. In T. Lickona, editor, Moral Development and Behavior Theory, Research and Social Issues. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Atkin, Charles K. (1972), Statement at Hearings before the Subcommittee on Communications of The United States Senate, March 24.

Atkin, Charles K. and W. Gantz (1974), Children's Response to Broadcast News: Exposure Evaluation and Learning. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism, San Diego, Ca., August.

Atkin, Charles K. and B. S. Greenberg (1977), Parental Mediation of Children's Social Behavior Learning from Television. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Association for Education in Journalism, Madison, Wisconsin, August.

Ball, S. and G. A. Bogatz (1972), Summative Research of Sesame Street: Implications for the Study of Preschool Children. In A. D. Pick, editor, Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology, Vol. 6. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.

Bandura, Albert (1977), Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, Albert and R. H. Walters (1959), Adolescent Aggression. New York: Ronald Press.

Barcus, F. E. (1969), Parental Influence on Children's T.V. Viewing. Television Quarterly, 8: 63-73.

Bruning, J. L. and B. L. Kintz (1968), Computational Handbook of Statistics. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co.

Burton, R. V., Maccoby, E. E. and W. Allinsmith (1961), Antecedents of Resistance to Temptation in Four-Year-Old Children. Child Development, 32: 689-710.

Chu, G. C. and W. Schramm (1967), Learning from Television: What the Research Says. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Educational Broadcasters.

Feshback, S. (1972), Reality and Fantasy in Filmed Violence. In J. P. Murray, E. A. Rubinstein and G. A. Comstock, editors, Television and Social Behavior, Vol. 2. Television and Social Learning. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Greenberg, B. S., C. K. Atkin, N. G. Edison and F. Korzenny (1977), Pro-Social and Anti-Social Behaviors on Commercial Television in 1975-76. Department of Communication, Michigan State University. Report to the Office of Child Development, HEW, Washington, D.C., February.

Greenberg, B. S., C. K. Atkin, N. G. Edison and F. Korzenny (1977), Pro-Social and Anti-Social Behaviors on Commercial Television in 1976-77. Department of Communication, Michigan State University. Report to the Office of Child Development, HEW, Washington, D.C., forthcoming.

Greenberg, B. S., P. M. Ericson, and M. Vlahos (1972), Children's Television Behavior as Perceived by Mother and Child. In E. A. Rubinstein, C. A. Comstock and J. P. Murray, editors, Television and Social Behavior, Vol. 4. Television in Day-to-Day Life: Patterns of Use. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, pp. 359-409.

Hannenman, Gerhard J. and Herbert S. Dordick et. al (1975), The Family Hour: A Solution in Search of a Problem. A Research Study of Los Angeles TV Viewers' Response to the Family Hour. Summary. Center for Communications Policy Research of the Annenberg School of Communications. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Henry, Jules (1971), Pathways to Madness. New York: Random House.

Hicks, D. J. (1968), Effects of Co-observer's Sanctions and Adult Presence on Imitative Aggression. Child Development, 38: 303-309.

Hoffman, Martin L. (1970), Moral Development. In Paul H. Mussen, editor, Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Hoffman, Martin L. (1975), Moral Internalization, Parental Power, and the Nature of Parent-Child Interaction. Developmental Psychology, 11(2): 228-239.

Hoffman, M. S. and H. D. Saltzstein (1967), Parent Discipline and the Child's Moral Development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 45-57.

Leifer, A. D. and D. F. Roberts (1972), Children's Responses to Television Violence. In J. P. Murray, E. A. Rubenstein, and G. A. Comstock, editors, Television and Social Behavior, Vol. 2: Television and Social Learning. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, pp. 43-180.

Leifer, A. D., N. J. Gordon, and S. B. Graves (1974), Children's Television: More Than Mere Entertainment. Harvard Educational Review, 44: 213-245.

Lickona, Thomas (1976), Critical Issues in the Study of Moral Development and Behavior. In Thomas Lickona, editor, Moral Development and Behavior Theory, Research, and Social Issues. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Lyle, J. and H. R. Hoffman (1972), Children's Use of Television and Other Media. In E. A. Rubinstein, G. A. Comstock, and J. P. Murray, editors, Television and Social Behavior, Vol. 4. Television in Day-to-Day Life: Patterns of Use. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, pp. 129-256.

McLeod, J. M., C. K. Atkin, and S. H. Chaffee (1972), Adolescents, Parents and TV Use: Adolescent Self-Support Measures from Maryland and Wisconsin Samples. In G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein, editors, Television and Social Behavior. Vol. 3, Television and Adolescent Aggressiveness. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, pp. 173-238.

Saltzstein, Herbert D. (1976), Social Influence and Moral Development: A Perspective on the Role of Parents and Peers. In Thomas Lickona, editor, Moral Development and Behavior Theory, Research and Social Issues. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sears, R. R., E. E. Maccoby, and H. Levin (1957), Patterns of Child Rearing. Evanston, Ill.: Peterson and Co.

Tolley, H. (1973), Children and War: Political Socialization to International Conflict. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Walling, James I. (1976), The Effect of Parental Interaction on Learning from T.V. Communication Education, Vol. 25.